

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 17, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-7 are currently pending, with claims 16-27 having been withdrawn. With this response, claims 1 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2002/0030657 to Kondo et al. (hereinafter "Kondo") in view of US Patent Publication 2002/0030657 to Matsushima (hereinafter "Matsushima"). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo and Matsushima, and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (hereinafter "Yamazaki").

As an initial matter, Applicants note that an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) disclosing several references was filed on June 16, 2006. Applicants respectfully point out that the Office Action did not indicate whether or not these references have been considered. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that PTO Form PTO/SB/08A, which was filed with the IDS on June 16, 2006 be initialed and that a copy of the same be forwarded to the Applicants.

The rejection of claims 1 and 3-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of Matsushima is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Kondo and Matsushima do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including "a data driver that supplies a video signal to drive the liquid crystal cells using first to (n-1)th data lines and then shifts the video signal by one channel to the right to drive the liquid crystal cells using the second to nth data lines." Applicants submit that no portion of Kondo teaches the above-identified feature of claim 1.

The Examiner cites Matsushima to cure the deficiency in the teachings of Kondo with respect to "an interlayer-insulation material formed by an organic insulation film having a dielectric constant less than 4." Applicants do not reach the Examiner's conclusion regarding the teachings of Matsushima. Applicants submit that Matsushima does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Kondo, and that Kondo and Matsushima, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach at least "a data driver that supplies a video signal to drive the liquid crystal cells using

first to (n-1)th data lines and then shifts the video signal by one channel to the right to drive the liquid crystal cells using the second to nth data lines” as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over Kondo and Matsushima.

Applicants note that claims 3-11 each depend from claim 1 and include all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly Applicants submit that claims 3-11 are each allowable over Kondo and Matsushima at least by way of their respective dependencies and for the reasons given for claim 1.

Claim 12 recites a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “a data driver that supplies a video signal to drive the liquid crystal cells using the first to (n-1)th data lines and that shifts the video signal by one channel to the right to drive the liquid crystal cells using the second to nth data lines.” In rejecting claim 12, the Examiner uses the same rationale given in the rejection of claim 1.

Applicants’ argument with respect to claim 1 is equally applicable to claim 12. Applicants submit that Kondo and Matsushima, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least “a data driver that supplies a video signal to drive the liquid crystal cells using the first to (n-1)th data lines and that shifts the video signal by one channel to the right to drive the liquid crystal cells using the second to nth data lines,” as recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is allowable over Kondo and Matsushima.

Applicants note that claims 13-15 each depend from claim 12 and include all of the elements of claim 12. Accordingly Applicants submit that claims 13-15 are each allowable over Kondo and Matsushima at least by way of their respective dependencies and for the reasons given for claim 12.

The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo and Matsushima and further in view of Yamazaki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Kondo, Matsushima and Yamazaki do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claim 2.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes by reference all of the elements of claim 1. As Applicants have discussed above claim 1 is allowable over Kondo and Matsushima. The Examiner cites Yamazaki as teaching, “an interlayer-insulation material includes a benzocyclobutene (BCB) resin film ([0322], lines 1-2).” Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusion concerning the teaching of Yamazaki. Applicants submit that Yamazaki does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Kondo and Matsushima with respect to claim 1.

Applicants submit that Kondo, Matsushima and Yamazaki, analyzed singly or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, and claim 2 depending from claim 1 are allowable over Kondo, Matsushima and Yamazaki.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2007

By Valerie P Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants